## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

| William H. Strickland,         |            | ) | C/A No. 6:10-2610-JFA-KFM |
|--------------------------------|------------|---|---------------------------|
|                                |            | ) |                           |
|                                | Plaintiff, | ) |                           |
| v.                             |            | ) | ORDER                     |
|                                |            | ) |                           |
| Hill Finklea Detention Center, |            | ) |                           |
|                                |            | ) |                           |
|                                | Defendant. | ) |                           |
|                                |            | ) |                           |

The *pro se* plaintiff, William Henry Strickland, is a pretrial detainee at the Hill Finklea Detention Center. He brings this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 alleging that he has incurred back pain and permanent back damage caused by his sleeping on a thin mattress on a concrete cell floor.

The Magistrate Judge assigned to this action<sup>1</sup> has prepared a thorough Report and Recommendation and opines that the action is subject to summary dismissal. The Report sets forth in detail the relevant facts and standards of law on this matter, and the court incorporates such without a recitation.

The plaintiff was advised of his right to file objections to the Report and Recommendation, which was entered on the docket on October 14, 2010. However, the plaintiff failed to file objections. In the absence of specific objections to the Report of the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The Magistrate Judge's review is made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02. The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific objection is made, and the court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

Magistrate Judge, this court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the

recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

As the Magistrate Judge correctly opines, the defendant is a group of buildings or

facility and does not act under color of state law. As such, the defendant is not subject to suit

under Section 1983.

After carefully reviewing the applicable laws, the record in this case, and the Report

and Recommendation, this court finds the Magistrate Judge's recommendation fairly and

accurately summarizes the facts and applies the correct principles of law.

For all the foregoing reasons, the Report and Recommendation is incorporated herein

by reference; and this complaint is summarily dismissed without prejudice and without

issuance and service of process.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

November 30, 2010

Columbia, South Carolina

Joseph F. Anderson, Jr.

Joseph F. anderson, J.

United States District Judge

2